Case: 1:08-cv-04883 Document #: 708 Filed: 01/26/11 Page 1 of 9 PageID #:8483

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS EASTERN DIVISION

IN RE: AFTERMARKET FILTERS ANTITRUST

LITIGATION

THIS DOCUMENT RELATES TO:

ALL CASES

Master Docket No. 1:08-cv-4883

MDL Docket No. 1957

Honorable Robert W. Gettleman Magistrate Geraldine Soat Brown

JOINT MOTION FOR RESOLUTION OF DISCOVERY DISPUTES

At the January 10, 2011 status conference, the Court directed the parties to meet and confer regarding the timing of both class- and merits-related depositions, and to present to this Court by motion any issues for which they could not reach agreement by January 26, 2011. The parties have met and conferred as directed, but were unable to reach agreement on three issues: (1) whether plaintiffs may serve additional requests for documents on defendants; (2) the duration of depositions; and (3) the deadlines for written discovery, third party discovery, and all fact discovery. Thus, the parties respectfully move for this Court to resolve these issues as set forth below.

I. BACKGROUND

Consistent with the Court's order on January 10, 2011, the parties conducted extensive meet and confer discussions over the course of two weeks regarding the scheduling of depositions and the completion of the remainder of discovery. The parties have scheduled, or are in the process of scheduling, more than 60 depositions (14 depositions of plaintiffs and 53 depositions of defense witnesses). Beyond those depositions, the parties have agreed to schedule indirect purchaser depositions promptly after the indirect purchaser plaintiffs move to amend their complaint, and the parties have agreed to a schedule for serving notices of, and objections

to, Rule 30(b)(6) deposition notices. The parties have made significant progress in these discussions. We have, however, reached an impasse on three issues, and respectfully request that the Court resolve these disputes. The parties' respective positions on each issue are set forth below.

II. REMAINING ISSUES IN DISPUTE

A. Document Discovery

The parties disagree as to whether all parties, except Plaintiff/Relator William G. Burch, have completed document discovery in this case. It is defendants' position that the Court's September 20, 2010 deadline for the "substantial completion of document production by all parties on both merits and class certification" (Dkt. #460) applied to all documents, and that the Court did not envision that parties would have another opportunity after that date to request additional documents. Plaintiffs served their first set of document requests on defendants on December 10, 2009 and their second set on March 31, 2010. They could have served additional requests at any time prior to the September 20, 2010 deadline, but they chose not to do so. Defendants' position is that the time for serving additional requests for documents has now passed.

Plaintiffs' disagree, and propose that they have until the end of the fact discovery period to serve additional requests for documents on defendants. Plaintiffs do not dispute that document discovery is substantially complete. Nonetheless, Plaintiffs believe that the parties should have the opportunity to pursue limited, additional document discovery to address issues that arise during the extensive testimonial discovery that will occur in the coming months.

¹ As set forth in the parties' January 26, 2011 Joint Status Report, the parties agree that Plaintiff/Relator William G. Burch may serve requests for documents that relate specifically to the *qui tam* case on defendants by February 23, 2011.

The parties request that the Court resolve this dispute and clarify whether the September 20, 2010 deadline applied to all document discovery, or whether the parties are permitted to seek additional document discovery until the close of fact discovery.

B. Deadlines for Fact Discovery

Based on Judge Brown's January 10, 2011 Order and Judge Gettleman's comments during the hearing on January 11, 2011, the parties attempted to reach an agreement regarding the schedule for all remaining discovery, including party depositions, third party discovery, interrogatories and requests for admissions. The parties were unable to agree on the deadlines to propose to the Court.

Defendants' position is that all fact discovery, including all party depositions, third party discovery, interrogatories and requests for admission should be completed by September 30, 2011. Plaintiffs would like until December 31, 2011 to complete party depositions. It is plaintiffs' position that the Court should not set a deadline for third party discovery, interrogatories or requests for admission at this time.

C. Duration of Depositions

Given the number of witnesses that will be deposed in this case, the parties agreed that it was important to discuss, and attempt to agree in advance, on the amount of time that each deposition will last. The parties were able to agree that certain depositions of key witnesses are likely to last longer than the seven hours that Rule 30(d) provides for. These witnesses include John Evans, Mark McDaniel, Ty Nilsson, Al Tobin, and Marlen Silverii, and the parties have agreed to meet and confer in advance of each of their depositions to attempt in good faith to agree upon the amount of time that will be required for each. However, the parties were not able to reach an agreement on the duration of the remaining depositions.

Defendants' position is that each deposition should last seven hours total. Because

defendants intend to cross-notice all defense witnesses, defendants may need some portion of

that time for their examinations of those witnesses. Thus, defendants propose that, if both

plaintiffs and defendants notice a defense witness's deposition, plaintiffs collectively will have

up to five hours to depose that witness, and defendants collectively will have up to two hours to

depose that witness. In the case of depositions of plaintiff witnesses, if both plaintiffs and

defendants notice a witness's deposition, defendants propose that defendants collectively will

have five hours and plaintiffs collectively will have two hours. Defendants' proposal applies to

all witnesses, including Rule 30(b)(1) witness who have been designated to address Rule

30(b)(6) topics.

Plaintiffs' position is that they are entitled under the Federal Rules to seven hours for

each deposition that they have noticed and that they should have the full amount of time for each

witness. In the event that a Rule 30(b)(1) witness is designated to address Rule 30(b)(6) topics,

it is plaintiffs' position that the parties should meet and confer to discuss whether additional time

is necessary. To the extent that defendants want to examine a witness, it is plaintiffs' position

that any examination by defendants must be in addition to plaintiffs' seven hour allotment, but

plaintiffs take no position on the amount of time that should be allotted to defendants, as long as

it is seven hours or less.

III. CONCLUSION

WHEREFORE defendants respectfully request that the Court enter Defendants' Proposed

Order Regarding Discovery. Plaintiffs respectfully request that the Court enter Plaintiffs'

Proposed Order Regarding Discovery.

Dated: January 26, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

4

Case: 1:08-cv-04883 Document #: 708 Filed: 01/26/11 Page 5 of 9 PageID #:8487

/s/ Peter J. Kadzik

Peter J. Kadzik

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street, NW Washington, DC 20006

Tel: 202-420-2200 Fax: 202-420-2201

Counsel for ArvinMeritor Inc., Purolator Products NA, LLC and Purolator Products

Company, LLC

/s/ Michael A. Paskin

Michael A. Paskin

CRAVATH, SWAINE & MOORE LLP

Worldwide Plaza 825 Eighth Avenue

New York, NY 10019-7475

Telephone: 212-474-1000

Fax: 212-474-3700

Counsel for Cummins Filtration Inc.

/s/ Darrell Prescott

Darrell Prescott

BAKER & MCKENZIE LLP

1114 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10036

Telephone: 212-626-4100

Fax: 212-310-1600

Counsel for Baldwin Filters Inc.

/s/ Margaret M. Zwisler

Margaret M. Zwisler

LATHAM & WATKINS LLP

555 Eleventh Street, NW

Suite 1000

Washington DC 20004-1304

Telephone: 202-637-1092

Fax: 202-637-2201

Counsel for Champion Laboratories, Inc.

/s/ James T. McKeown

James T. McKeown

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP

777 East Wisconsin Avenue

Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202 Telephone: 414-297-5530

Fax: 414-297-4900

Counsel for Donaldson Company, Inc.

/s/ Richard G. Parker

Richard G. Parker

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

1625 Eye Street, NW

Washington, DC 20006-4001

Telephone: 202-383-5300

Edward Hassi

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP

7 Times Square

New York, NY 10036

Telephone: 212-326-2000

Counsel for Honeywell International Inc.

/s/ John DeQ. Briggs

John DeQ. Briggs

AXINN VELTROP HARKRIDER 1330 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.

Washington, DC 20036 Telephone: 202-721-5400

Fax: 202-912-4701

Counsel for Wix Filtration Corp LLC and

Affinia Group, Inc.

/s/ Bernard Persky Gregory Asciolla

Benjamin D. Bianco

New York, NY 10005

Telephone: (212) 907-0700 Facsimile: (212) 818-0477

140 Broadway

LABATON SUCHAROW LLP

/s/ Michael J. Freed

Steven A. Kanner William H. London Douglas A. Millen Michael E. Moskovitz

FREED KANNER LONDON & MILLEN

LLC

2201 Waukegan Rd.

Suite 130

Bannockburn, IL 60015 Telephone: 224-632-4500

Fax: 224-632-4521

Co-Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser

Plaintiffs

Co-Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser

Plaintiffs

/s/ Roberta D. Liebenberg

Donald L. Perelman Adam Pessin

FINE KAPLAN & BLACK, R.P.C.

1835 Market Street

28th Floor

Philadelphia, PA 19103 Telephone: 215-567-6565

Fax: 215-568-5872

Co-Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser

Plaintiffs

/s/ Renae D. Steiner

Renae D. Steiner Vincent J. Esades Katherine Kelly

Heins Mills & Olson, P.L.C.

310 Clifton Avenue

/s/ Marc M. Seltzer

Marc M. Seltzer Vineet Bhatia Stuart V. Kusin

SUSMAN GODFREY LLP

Suite 950

1901 Avenue of the Stars Los Angeles, CA 90067-6029 Telephone: (310) 789-3100

Fax: (310) 789-3150

Co-Lead Counsel for Direct Purchaser

Plaintiffs

/s/ Richard M. Hagstrom

Richard M. Hagstrom

Zelle, Hofmann, Voelbel, Mason & Gette, LLP 500 Washington Avenue South, Suite 4000

Minneapolis, MN 55415

(612) 339-2020

Case: 1:08-cv-04883 Document #: 708 Filed: 01/26/11 Page 7 of 9 PageID #:8489

Minneapolis, MN 55403

(612) 338-4605

(612) 338-4692 (facsimile)

Co-Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser

Plaintiffs

/s/ Mario N. Alioto

Mario N. Alioto Lauren C. Russell

Trump, Alioto, Trump & Prescott, LLP

2280 Union Street

San Francisco, CA 94123 Telephone: (415) 563-7200

Co-Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser

Plaintiffs

/s/ Christopher R. Hunt

CHRISTOPHER R. HUNT

Assistant Attorney General OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL,

ANTITRUST DIVISION

PL-01, The Capitol Tallahassee, FL 32399-

1050

Telephone: (850) 414-3300

Facsimile: (850) 488-9134

Counsel for the State of Florida, Office of the

Attorney General

(612) 336-9100 (facsimile)

 ${\it Co-Lead \ Counsel \ for \ Indirect \ Purchaser}$

Plaintiffs

/s/ Christopher Lovell

Christopher Lovell

LOVELL STEWART HALEBIAN LLP

500 Fifth Avenue, Floor 58 New York, NY 10110

(212) 608-1900

clovell@lshllp.com

Co-Lead Counsel for Indirect Purchaser

Plaintiffs

/s/ Martin R. Fox

Martin R. Fox

BLEAU FOX, A P.L.C.

3575 Cahuenga Blvd., Suite 580

Los Angeles, CA 90068

Tel: 323-874-8613

Fax: 323-874-1234

Joseph M. Alioto

ALIOTO LAW FIRM

555 California Street, Suite 3160

San Francisco, CA 94104

Tel: 415-434-8900

Fax: 415-434-9200

Gary D. McCallister

GARY D. MCCALLISTER & ASSOCIATES,

LLC

120 North LaSalle Street, Suite 2800

Chicago, Illinois 60602

Telephone: (312) 345-0611

Fax: (312) 345-0612

Counsel for Loodvik Peerali and Oyster

Incorporated

/s/ Mark I. Labaton

Motley Rice LLP

1100 Glendon South Eighth Street

Los Angeles, CA 90024 Telephone: (310) 500-3540

Fax: (310) 824-2870

G. Steven Stidham Sneed Lang Herrold, P.C. 1700 Williams Center Tower 1 One West Third Street Tulsa, OK 74103-3552 Telephone: (918) 588-1313

Counsel for William G. Burch

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Marguerite M. Sullivan, hereby certify that on January 26, 2011, I caused the foregoing Joint Motion for Resolution of Discovery Disputes to be filed with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send notification of such filing to all parties indicated on the electronic filing receipt. I also caused the foregoing Joint Motion for Resolution of Discovery Disputes to be served on the following individual via electronic mail:

G. Steven Stidham
Sneed Lang Herrold
1700 Williams Center Tower 1
One West Third Street
Tulsa, OK 74103-3552
gstidham@sneedlangherrold.com

/s/ Marguerite M. Sullivan
Marguerite M. Sullivan